

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 26271 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 25th August, 2020

Hari Parkash

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. MURLIDHAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

Present : Mr. Vikram Punia, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

S. Muralidhar, J.

1. It is agreed by Mr. Vikram Punia, learned Counsel for the Petitioner that the issues raised in the present writ petition, challenging the acquisition proceedings culminating in the Award dated 8th October, 2003, stand concluded against the Petitioner after the judgment dated 6th March, 2020 of the Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in ***Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal and Ors., etc. AIR 2020 1496.***

2. Even as regards the only issue before this Court i.e. whether the compensation amount was deposited in the revenue account and was available with the Land Acquisition Collector as on the date of passing of the award, the Respondents have produced the record to show that the

entire compensation amount was remitted to the account of DRO on 7th October, 2003 itself.

3. In that view of the matter, no grounds remain for challenging the land acquisition proceedings. As such, the writ petition is dismissed.

4. Mr. Vikram Punia, learned counsel for the Petitioner, states that the Petitioner seeks to invoke Section 101 A of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, which provision is exclusive to the State of Haryana. If the Petitioners chose to do, it will be open to the Respondents to examine and dispose of such claim in accordance with law.

5. The petition is dismissed with the above observations.

(S. MURALIDHAR)
JUDGE

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

25th August, 2020
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No